



**{In Archive} RE: FW: Senate Bill 532** 

**Ray Leissner** to: Joe Ball

03/09/2012 11:53 AM

From: Ray Leissner/R6/USEPA/US  
To: Joe Ball <Joe.Ball@LA.GOV>  
Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

My question was directed at the restriction on using drinking water. Are you saying the cost of developing alternative water sources, above the cost incurred to connect and utilize the local PWS, is prohibitive?

If true, and water quality is not an issue, it would seem to point out that a PWS can produce and treat and transport water more cheaply than producing untreated fresh water on site. Go figure.

Ray Leissner, Env. Eng.  
Ground Water / UIC Section (6WQ-SG)  
(214) 665 - 7183  
USEPA, Region 6

The FIRST STEP in protecting your ground water is to have your well tested.

Joe Ball

It would be more than a minor inconvenience es...

03/09/2012 11:08:07 AM

From: Joe Ball <Joe.Ball@LA.GOV>  
To: Ray Leissner/R6/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 03/09/2012 11:08 AM  
Subject: RE: FW: Senate Bill 532

It would be more than a minor inconvenience especially when the average cost to prepare one is hovering around \$500,000. There are some holes in the proposed bill, such as no definition of drinking water. By the way, this bill is another attempt to stop the expansion of one already existing gas storage facility in a south Louisiana Parish. The last time this was attempted legislatively, the one already existing gas storage facility in a south Louisiana Parish sued the state. The court ruled the law was unconstitutional.

**From:** Ray Leissner [mailto:Leissner.Ray@epamail.epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 09, 2012 10:44 AM  
**To:** Joe Ball  
**Subject:** Re: FW: Senate Bill 532

Joe,

Interesting but it seems to me that should be a minor inconvenience to the industry. Is fresh water production controlled to the extent they must rely on water treated to drinking water standards? Or is the GW or surface water, for some quality based reason, not the preferred fluid for dissolution? Why would they opt for a more expensive alternative to fresh GW or surface water?

Ray Leissner, Env. Eng.  
Ground Water / UIC Section (6WQ-SG)  
(214) 665 - 7183

USEPA, Region 6

The FIRST STEP in protecting your ground water is to have your well tested.

From: Joe Ball <[Joe.Ball@LA.GOV](mailto:Joe.Ball@LA.GOV)>

To: Mike Frazier/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Ray Leissner/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Brian Graves/R6/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 03/08/2012 01:09 PM

Subject: FW: Senate Bill 532

---

Would y'all have an idea of what it might cost to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement? See below.

**From:** Joe Ball

**Sent:** Monday, March 05, 2012 12:15 PM

**To:** Laurence Bland; Teresa Rougon; Jeffery Miller; Jim Welsh; Blake Canfield; Matt Simon; Gary Ross

**Subject:** Senate Bill 532

SB 532 has been pre-filed by Senator Mills that would have a major statewide impact on the existing and future solution mining industry and those that propose using salt caverns to store hydrocarbons. The pertinent part of the bill reads:

“The commissioner shall not authorize or issue any class II hydrocarbon storage well permit or class III brine extraction well permit that uses in excess of two million gallons of drinking water per day, without first requiring that the applicant provide to the commissioner an environmental impact statement subject to federal standards . . . .”

---

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This email communication may contain confidential information which also may be legally privileged and is intended only for the use of the intended recipients identified above. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized review, use, dissemination, distribution, downloading, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by reply email, delete the communication and destroy all copies.

COMPUTER SYSTEM USE/CONSENT NOTICE

This message was sent from a computer system which is the property of the State of Louisiana and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). It is for authorized business use only. Users (authorized or unauthorized) have no explicit or implicit expectation of privacy. Any or all uses of this system and all files on this system may be intercepted, monitored, recorded, copied, audited, inspected, and disclosed to Department of Natural Resources and law enforcement personnel. By using this system the user consents to such interception, monitoring, recording, copying, auditing, inspection, and disclosure at the discretion of DNR.[attachment "SB 532.pdf" deleted by Ray Leissner/R6/USEPA/US]